

REMARKS

Upon entry of the instant Amendment, Claims 1-16 are pending. Applicant gratefully acknowledges that Claim 14 was indicated to be allowable if amended into independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 14 has been so amended and thus should be allowable. Applicants further gratefully acknowledge that claims 12 and 16 were objected to but indicated to be allowable if claim 12 were amended to overcome various objections. Claim 12 has been so amended and thus claims 12 and 16 should be allowable. Claims 1 and 8 have been amended to provide additional clarity and overcome the Section 112 rejections.

The Specification was objected to because "[t]he top margins do not leave enough space and holes have been punched through the words at the top of the page." Applicant submits herewith a new copy of the Specification including the claims with new margins. No new matter has been added.

The drawings were objected to as being informal drawings. Applicant submits herewith formal drawings. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-6 and 8-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 1 was indicated to be unclear, with reference to the recitation "if said comparing indicates that data has been written into said redundant portion..." Claim 1 has been amended to recite that "overwrite data has been written..." In claim 8, the recitation "or said segment" was indicated to be unclear. Claim 8 has been amended to recite "of said segment." Applicants respectfully submit that these corrections of typographical errors provide sufficient clarity to overcome the Section 112 rejection. As such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of the claims.

Claims 7, 13, and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Natrasevschi et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,475,820 ("Natrasevschi") in view of Ozawa, Japanese Patent No. JP04100338A ("Ozawa"). Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention is not taught, suggested, or implied by Natrasevschi or Ozawa, either singly or in combination. Claim 7 relates to a method for allocating memory segments and providing for initial and redundant allocation to determine if an erroneous overwrite has occurred. In particular, Claim 7 recites:

A method for allocating memory segments so as to provide for detecting memory corruption comprising:
 at initial memory segment allocation, providing a redundant portion at the logical end of a memory segment, said redundant portion containing data derived from an initial header portion of said segment; and
 providing a verify memory routine for comparing said redundant portion to said initial portion to determine if an erroneous overwrite has occurred.

Similarly, claim 13 relates to a system able to determine if an overwrite has occurred and, in particular, claim 13 (and hence, dependent claim 15) recites:

An information processing system comprising:
 a process space containing a plurality of executable logic components;
 buffer allocation logic able to establish a buffer structure in a memory space;
 buffer write logic able to write data to buffers; and
 buffer verify logic able to determine if an overwrite has occurred by comparing a header portion and an initial portion of a written to buffer

In contrast, Natrasevschi relates to a write-once read-many (WORM) memory and, in particular, to *preventing* an overwrite from occurring, rather than determining *if* an overwrite has occurred, as generally recited in the claims. That is, in Natraseschi, data are written to the medium. Pointers in a management directory then define contiguously written areas of the media, with flag bits within sectors then defining when free sectors are available when the management directory is filled. Before a new write operation occurs, a check is made; if the pointers indicate the address is in an already-written sector, an error indication is made. Natraseschi does not, however, relate to

determining, by comparing initial header and redundant end portions of a memory segment, whether an overwrite has occurred. Indeed, Natraveschi teaches that such a comparison would be pointless, because for example if “an attempt is made on this [WORM] media to write on this media a second or subsequent times, the new data is written over the old data, resulting in garbled data which is unintelligible.” Col. 1, lines 41-44. Thus, such a comparison as recited in the claim at issue cannot be made.

Ozawa is relied on for allegedly teaching in a transmission system “inputting a same nonreproducible data to a head record and a final record of a transmission data and comparing the head record with the final record at reception so as to confirm the coincidence.” While this may have something to do with data transmission, it does not appear to relate to memory buffers or segments as generally recited in the claim. Because, however, neither Natraveschi nor Ozawa provide for detecting whether an overwrite of a memory segment has occurred, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

Serial No.: 09/636,209

Attorney Docket No.: 00P07812US

For all of the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance, which allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully requested,

SIEMENS CORPORATION

By: 

David D. Chung
Registration No: 38,409
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Tel.: 650-694-5339
Fax: 650-968-4517

Date: 27 August 03

SIEMENS CORPORATION
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830
ATTENTION: Elsa Keller, Legal Department
Telephone: (732) 321-3026